

Date: Tue, 1 Mar 94 04:30:09 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #90  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 1 Mar 94                      Volume 94 : Issue    90

Today's Topics:

CW  
HELP W/2 METER BAND PLAN  
Our high-tech future.  
The \*language\* requirement!

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----

Date: 28 Feb 94 21:35:00 GMT  
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu  
Subject: CW  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I don't know guys, maybe I'm weird. I have always liked CW. I have my DXCC  
with CW  
on 4 bands. I have found that there are many many times where phone was  
either  
difficult or impossible and CW was not a problem. It is much easier to copy  
a very  
weak and noisy CW signal than a weak and noisy phone signal. Don't forget,  
ham radio began in CW. I think that CW is the very basis of amateur radio  
and should  
always be that way. I don't mean to insult any of the no-code techs out  
there, but I think  
that it was a mistake for the FCC to remove CW as a requirement for a  
license. I got  
my license at a time when the novice class was good for only two years and

was not  
renewable, you had to either upgrade or lose you license. At that time,  
novices were  
rock-bound, no VFOs. I know that lack of funding is a major cause of the  
"softening"  
of the FCC. Anyway, I'll step down from my soapbox....  
73 gentlemen and ladies.

Kevin (WB5RUE)  
muenzlerk@uthscsa.edu or  
muenzlerk@thorin.uthscsa.edu

-----  
Date: 27 Feb 1994 20:23:12 -0600  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!cs.utexas.edu!not-for-  
mail@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: HELP W/2 METER BAND PLAN  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Will someone please share with me the arrangement of the 2 meter band?  
What I need the most is the portion of the band that is reserved for  
simplex operation. I fear just selecting a random frequency to use as  
a simplex channel as it may be part or a repeater pair. Part of the  
band is reserved for simplex but I am not sure as to which part.  
Appreciate any help on this.  
Jim Jones K5GSH  
jjones@bigcat.missouri.edu

-----  
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 1994 17:55:03 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!uwm.edu!mixcom.com!  
kevin.jessup@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: Our high-tech future.  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I'd like to discuss the future of amateur radio and the current licensing  
structure. This is just my opinion. Please take it as such. I'm certain  
MANY will dissagree.

I am employed as an electrical engineer by a manufacturer of microprocessor-  
based medical electronic equipment. I concentrate largely on software related  
to data compression, file transfer, networking and data security. Previous  
to that I did digital hardware design. Most of our products are designed from  
the ground up. This includes both the hardware and the software. We even  
design products that use low power RF for high-speed data communication using  
both narrow band FM and direct sequence spread spectrum. The NFM designs  
operate around 200 MHz and the SS equipment is in the 2 to 3 GHz band. We

also have designed a system that sends digital data via the existing analog cellular phone system.

I'd like to discuss our knowledge of radio theory. This not only includes RF theory, but other disciplines that are used to accomplish what we call RF communication. I am NOT anti CW. Let me just say that I have recently passed my 5 WPM code and am reluctantly working on 13 WPM. I do not want this article to degenerate into a code vs nocode debate regarding the need for a code test so as to gain HF access. As far as my interest in HF, there is almost none. If all code requirements were dropped, I still would be working largely on the theory I need to begin a 900 MHz direct sequence spread spectrum project. My interests are largely in VHF and above and the seldom used high-speed digital modes. My interest in HF is only enough to keep me aware of any high-tech developments in HF gear (such as DSP) and any new modulation techniques or digital modes/protocols. That said, let's move on to the issues of electronic theory and our goal of "advancing the state of the radio art".

The March, 1994 issue of QST has a nice article on cellular phones. It points out some interesting modulation techniques used by analog cellular technology. It barely scratches the surface when it comes to techniques currently under development such as CDMA/SS (a form of direct sequence spread spectrum). The author, Norman Stone, WG1C, does a fine job of explaining a very complex system for those who are not knowledgeable of the newer modulation techniques or digital communication and protocols. Apart from the workings of the current analog cellular system, the article does not go into too much theory.

The article is very thought provoking. Stone extrapolates to the very near future when he says. "Dick Tracy's futuristic wrist radio isn't yet a reality, but it's close. VERY close." He makes a quick reference to the much hyped "information superhighway" when he mentions, "...personal communications services where everyone is connected to a world-wide voice and data network via miniature portable [read RF based] terminals." Other important quotes from the article I'd like to bring up here are these...

"A technological revolution is taking place that can enhance all forms of amateur communication."

"It's obvious that there will be a continuous push for more spectrum for personal and data communications...  
...amateurs must seek ways to most efficiently use their spectrum."

"Hams are independent by nature, but one requirement of all new systems is that some form of protocols and standards be available for all to consider."

Amen! The information superhighway, while currently hyped a great deal, is NOT very far away. Cellular systems will evolve from analog to multimedia digital

personal communications devices that send digitized voice as easily as data files, faxes and real-time video. Low power tightly networked cells (on a much tighter scale than is currently used by the analog cellular phone system) will accomplish this via spread spectrum on the GHz bands. In perhaps 15 years or less, this will be a reality throughout ALL industrialized nations.

Again, it will be a small portable device, available to the masses. You will be able to have a multimedia video/audio conversation with anyone in the world who is on the network. All real-time! Where does this leave amateur radio as far as HF, VHF and UHF? Hopelessly behind the times.

\*\*\*\*\*

You will not be impressing your neighbors when you fire up \$4000 worth of RF gear and a \$2000 tower and beam to establish your global QSO when they can do it more effectively and reliably with their wrist-watch sized "personal digital communicator"!!

\*\*\*\*\*

It's time for a collective kick-in-the-pants for ALL of the amateur radio community. We must wake up and smell the coffee before the commercial RF world runs over us like a runaway train. Do we want to be a part of the future or a relic of the past?

The problem is the current licensing structure with regard to THEORY. Not only has the theory been "dumbed down" and made too simple, THE INCENTIVE SYSTEM IS BACKWARDS! Yes, it's just fine to require CW for HF access since the ITU requires it. I'm talking theory here. The current structure with the codeless tech license makes VHF and above look like the "beginners way" into ham radio while high power HF global communication is something every HAM should aspire to. Is this way of thinking encouraging the high-tech modes given the advances being made in commercial RF? The tougher tests should give you access to UHF and up, NOT 30 MHz and below! We need to encourage technical competence in the bands of the 1990s. Those bands, ladies and gentlemen, are ABOVE 30 MHz, not below.

"Upgrading" should mean demonstrated knowledge or, better still, a hands-on project using one of the newer modes of communication. I thought one of our main goals was "advancing the state of the radio art". In fact, one of the questions on the novice written exam (2A-1.3) is, "The amateur service rules were designed to provide a radio communications service that meets five fundamental principles. Which of the following is NOT one of those principles?" The answer is "preserving the history of radio communications".

Despite our supposed goal of advancing the state of the art, the current system rewards one's study of the theory with access to the HF bands and "older" modes of communication while those operating on 2-meters and above are often frowned upon. How does this mentality keep us technically up-to-date?

Warning!! Here's a suggestion that will REALLY ruffle a few feathers!! It is also meant to be taken with a rather LARGE grain of salt. The code and the theory requirements currently work as a "filter" to keep the HF bands from overcrowding and turning into another form of citizens band. On the contrary, if it WERE easier to get on HF, the band would indeed become more crowded and technically competent radio amateurs would be forced to both move to higher frequencies AND develop more technically advanced HF forms of modulation and communication that cut through all the HF QRM and QRN.

I really don't think the above should be done, but here is the point. In my opinion, the current system does not encourage experimentation on the "high-tech" bands. Radio amateurs are respected more based on their number of worldwide HF contacts rather than technical accomplishments using local, high-speed digital modes or more advanced forms of analog voice communication.

Radio communication in the 1990s and beyond is not just RF. RF is a SMALL part of "systems-level" communication. Digital design, software and knowledge of networking protocols and user interfaces are just as important, if not more so, as RF theory, antenna erection, SWR measurement and antenna design. It's high time for the ARRL to wake up and change ALL tests to reflect this. The communications systems of the not too distant future will not be just "radios". They will be a sophisticated union of the radio, the television, the telephone, the computer and (most importantly) the computer network.

Yes, HF today is fun. QSL card collecting and contesting and field day can be VERY fun. But let's not lose sight of what the rest of the world is doing. It will very soon pass us by if we do not encourage technical competence across a wide range of disciplines. Placing the emphasis and "prestige" of amateur radio in voice and CW communication below 30 MHz will not, in my opinion, accomplish that.

To be fair, let me also say that I am very much aware that change cannot happen overnight, especially in a hobby with a history as full and respected as ours. Indeed, that I am able to participate in and be a part of this hobby is because of the work done by the pioneers of amateur radio. If we have advanced to more sophisticated modes of communication it is because of work done by those who moved us from the vacuum tube to the 50 MHz (and beyond) microprocessor. Thanks to the "old timers" who worked so hard to advance us from spark gap to today's casual and often "taken for granted" use of repeaters. Were it not for them, I would not be able to look beyond what we now have and into the future.

Also, let me give my heartfelt congratulations to ALL who have upgraded or only recently entered the hobby under the existing amateur radio testing system. No matter if you find code or RF theory difficult (or both!) you are to be congratulated and respected. Yes, even the "no codes". Regardless

of your license class, please don't stop studying NEW things. Computers and new forms of modulation will define our future. The advanced and extra class theory tests only begin to test the knowledge required for the high-speed multimedia communications of tomorrow. Let's all continue to be a part of the future by going beyond what is necessary for passing the theory tests. I know we can't all be electrical engineers or electronics technicians, nor should we be. Still, let's all try to be receptive to new technology and encourage our use of it.

I am happy to be a part of amateur radio and I have great respect for the hobby. It is not my intent to belittle ANY of the work done or accomplishments made by the old timers, the "brass pounders" or amateur radio in general. Indeed, even running and maintaining a "simple" repeater requires much time, effort and technical expertise. I personally am involved with an assembly language software project to extend the capabilities of our repeater's existing controller. I know first-hand the commitment it takes to contribute technically to an amateur radio club.

My only intent here was to sound an alarm (hopefully not too loud) regarding our future. I don't want us to miss out on any of the fun and I certainly don't want our knowledge of radio to become a knowledge of antiquity.

Looking forward to further conversations on the air or on the internet. 73!

```
--
  /'-_      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com
{      }/    Marquette Electronics, Inc
 \      /    N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio
  |__*|    N9SQB @ WD9ANY.#MKE.WI.USA.NA
```

-----  
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 1994 22:11:38 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!  
ez006683@network.ucsd.edu  
Subject: The \*language\* requirement!  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Dan Pickersgill (dan@mystis.wariat.org) wrote:  
: jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

: > No way. NO ONE on here does that. You should be ashamed of yourself for  
: > even thinking that. [hee hee]  
: > I couldn't resist, Dan; 73,  
: > Jeff NH6IL

: Jeff,

: When have I ever said that \_I\_ will not take the time to learn the code.  
: I am putting in more practice as I get the time free. (My schedule is  
: busy but getting more managable, at least until Skywarn season.) And  
: running the only 2-Meter repeater MCW practice around here means that  
: at least once a week I sit down with 1 1/2 hours of MCW practice.  
: Dan N8PKV,

Dan,

IT WAS A JOKE, take a pill and join the rest of us rolling on the floor  
with tears running down our faces!!! :-)

Dan "not that one" Todd

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                      Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu            *
*                      Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102           *
*                      Davis CA 95616                         *
*-----*
* All opinions expressed herein are completely fictitious any *
* resemblance to actual opinions of persons living or dead is  *
* completely coincidental.                                     *
*-----*
```

-----

Date: 27 Feb 1994 20:29:08 -0600

From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!uuneo.NeoSoft.com!sugar.NeoSoft.COM!  
not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <RS4K3YF.edellers@delphi.com>, <2kr55h\$6q2@sugar.neosoft.com>,  
<2kr8hd\$6ck@mercury.mcs.com>

Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

In article <2kr8hd\$6ck@mercury.mcs.com>,  
Bill Blum N9VLS <n9vls@MCS.COM> wrote:

>Where are we going? Planet 10! When are we going? Real Soon!

Buckeroo Banzai!!!

--

Radiographers who are able to use a radiographic machine well are

great assets to the health care facility in which they are employed.

--Dianne C. DeVos, "Basic Principles of Radiographic Exposure"

-----  
Date: 27 Feb 1994 16:57:49 -0600  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!  
news.kei.com!ddsw1!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2koih3\$ebo@paperboy.ids.net>, <RS4K3YF.edellers@delphi.com>,  
<2kr55h\$6q2@sugar.neosoft.com>  
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

In article <2kr55h\$6q2@sugar.neosoft.com>,  
A great x ray technician! <xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> wrote:  
>In article <RS4K3YF.edellers@delphi.com>,  
>Ed Ellers <edellers@delphi.com> wrote:  
>>Rev. Michael P. Deignan <kd1hz@anomaly.sbs.com> writes:  
>>  
>>>But Ed, if you were able to memorize the hundreds of questions necessary  
>>>to get your technician license, how hard could 40-some itty-bitty  
>>>code characters be?  
>>  
>>NO. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO. NO.  
>>  
>>I most certainly did NOT "memorize the hundreds of questions." I haven't even  
>>looked at a question pool for the Novice or Technician elements. I passed those  
>>elements based on what I have LEARNED over the years.  
>  
>Why JUST the Novice and Technician pool? What about the General, Advanced,  
>and Extra pools? Oh wait...that nasty Morse is holding you back.  
>

Contrary to the belief of many people who hold Amateur Extra licenses,  
there are technician class licensees with clues, who don't deserve to catch  
hell immediately upon their entry into the hobby for choosing to go the no  
code entry route into the world of amateur radio....  
and contrary to the belief of some technician class licensees, the ITU  
requirements for morse knowledge for HF access are NOT likely to change.

This thread is possibly the worst PR that can be propagated thru the  
internet for the ham radio community..... I hope everyone realizes this.

Bill Blum, N9VLS  
(for the record, it's a nocode tech license. I hold a csce for the  
remaining question pools. I'm still trying to pass my code tests, and I'm



not complaining about it either.)  
(of course, I'm not complaining because once I pass at least the 13wpm code test, my great uncle is giving me a Kenwood TS-820. :) )  
(For further record, I'll be in the market for working 6146Bs, and possibly a Cushcraft R7 come the fall when my qth changes.)

--  
Bill Blum                    n9vls@mcs.com                    West Lafayette, IN  
Where are we going?    Planet 10!    When are we going?    Real Soon!

-----  
Date: 27 Feb 1994 20:44:56 -0600  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!news.kei.com!ddsw1!not-for-mail@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <2kr55h\$6q2@sugar.neosoft.com>, <2kr8hd\$6ck@mercury.mcs.com>,  
<2krktk\$g6e@sugar.neosoft.com>il  
Subject : Re: Morse Whiners

In article <2krktk\$g6e@sugar.neosoft.com>,  
A great x ray technician! <xraytech@sugar.NeoSoft.COM> wrote:  
>In article <2kr8hd\$6ck@mercury.mcs.com>,  
>Bill Blum N9VLS <n9vls@MCS.COM> wrote:  
>  
>>Where are we going?    Planet 10!    When are we going?    Real Soon!  
>  
>Buckeroo Banzai!!!

shhhhhhhhhhh.  
I'm cutting phasing cables for a DF antenna.    You're bothering me.

--  
Bill Blum                    n9vls@mcs.com                    West Lafayette, IN  
Where are we going?    Planet 10!    When are we going?    Real Soon!

-----  
Date: Sun, 27 Feb 1994 22:18:41 GMT  
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!news.ucdavis.edu!chip.ucdavis.edu!ez006683@network.ucsd.edu  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <jfhCLsBMn.7nJ@netcom.com>,  
<rcrw90-250294135425@waters.corp.mot.com.corp.mot.com>,  
<1994Feb27.133807.12203@ke4zv.atl.ga.us>  
Subject : Re: On-line Repeater Directory

Gary Coffman (gary@ke4zv.atl.ga.us) wrote:

: "The SERA repeater index may be published or reproduced in any form  
: by any publication or electronic means to be distributed without  
: charge. Appropriate credit must be given to the SERA Repeater Journal."

: SERA lists 10 southeastern states in the Journal, Georgia, Tennessee,  
: Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Virginia, West  
: Virginia, and including the T-MARC coordinated repeaters in Maryland,  
: Delaware, and DC. \*This\* is where the ARRL gets their listings for these  
: states. They don't pay a dime for them, or for the man-years of effort  
: that went into the coordinations and database. They don't even have the  
: courtsey to give SERA credit for the information.

Hey Gary,

That sounds great, can you get a copy of that in an electronic format for  
the net? If so, that would be 20% of the states needed for Conway's  
project from a non-ARRL source.

cheers,

Dan

--

```
*-----*
* Daniel D. Todd      Packet: KC6UUD@KE6LW.#nocal.ca.usa      *
*                    Internet: ddtodd@ucdavis.edu              *
*                    Snail Mail: 1750 Hanover #102             *
*                    Davis CA 95616                           *
*-----*
* All opinions expressed herein are completely fictitious any  *
* resemblance to actual opinions of persons living or dead is  *
* completely coincidental.                                     *
*-----*
```

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #90

\*\*\*\*\*